

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/858,183	05/14/2001	Kerry Bradley	SJ1-010US	9316
29149	7590 10/15/2003	EXAMINER		
LEE & HAY	YES, PLLC ERSIDE AVENUE, SUITI	EVANISKO, GEORGE ROBERT		
SPOKANE,	•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3762	رار
			DATE MAILED: 10/15/2003	1 0

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/858,183	BRADLEY ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	George R Evanisko	3762			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with t	he correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute. - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply of within the statutory minimum of thirty (30 will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS, cause the application to become ABAND	be timely filed) days will be considered timely. from the mailing date of this communication. ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 A	<u> August 2003</u> .				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Th	is action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under					
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>67-76</u> is/are pending in the application					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.				
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
	Claim(s) 67-76 is/are rejected.				
· — · · · · — ·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o Application Papers	r election requirement.				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accept		Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on					
If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep					
12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.				
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No				
Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bu See the attached detailed Office action for a list	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	_			
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti	•				
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language pro	visional application has been	received.			
Attachment(s)	io priority under 55 0.5.0. 88	120 ana/01 (21)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Infor	mary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) mal Patent Application (PTO-152)			
S. Patent and Trademark Office					

Application/Control Number: 09/858,183

Art Unit: 3762

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 74 and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 74 does not further limit the parent claim since claim 67 sets forth four electrodes. It is inherent if four electrodes are provided, that all the electrodes must not be common since a common electrode would mean there would only be three electrodes.

Claim 75 is vague and conflicts with claim 67 since claim 67 sets out a minimum of four electrodes (a first pair and a second pair), but claim 75 states that at least one of the electrodes is common, leading to a two or three electrode situation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Art Unit: 3762

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 67-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Bakels et al (6070100).

Claims 67, 68, 70, and 73-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Salo et al (6278894).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George R Evanisko whose telephone number is 703 308-2612. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on 703 308-5181. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308-1148.

GRE October 9, 2003 GEORGE R. EVANISKO PRIMARY EXAMINER